



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE PRONOMINAL USE OF *ὁ αὐτός* IN PLATO

By J. ELMORE

One of the questions raised by a study of Plato's use of *ὁ αὐτός* is whether in certain passages this phrase has not a purely pronominal function, standing as a pronoun of reference (with the added idea of identity) for a preceding substantive. It is clear that this usage is not in itself improbable. In English "the same," though for the most used adjectively or substantively, is often a pronoun, as in Browning, *The Ring and the Book* I. 1263, "He bows the head, . . . Writes some three brief lines, signs and seals the same." This use of "the same" as a strengthened personal pronoun of reference occurs in all periods of the language and is frequent in our modern speech. Even more common in this construction is the German *derselbe*. "Fruchtbare Umgestaltung einer Theorie," says Steinthall, "ist nicht möglich ohne die gründlichste Kritik derselben." In Latin the usage has a double aspect. It is implied whenever *idem* represents a previously expressed subject with a second predicate (cf. Lane, *Lat. Gram.* 2371), but it appears still more clearly when the oblique cases of *idem* are employed for the corresponding forms of *is*.

According to Meader (*Lat. Pron.*, pp. 195, 196) this latter idiom occurs as early as Cornelius Nepos. Later "it found favor with the historians, chiefly during the period of the Silver Latin." Two examples may be quoted—Tac. *An.* i. 23. 2: *ut pars militum gladiatores qui e servitio Blaesi erant, pars ceteram eiusdem familiam vincirent*; Lucan *Phars.* 510: *O faciles dare summa deos, eademque tueri difficiles*. The idiom is thus apparent in case of "the same," *derselbe*, and *idem*, and it seems not improbable that it may exist also in the case of *ὁ αὐτός*.

A nearer analogy is that of *ὁ προειρημένος*, which also in later authors becomes pronominal (as Polyb. i. 9. 3: *γήμας δὲ τὴν θυγατέρα τοῦ προειρημένου . . . ἐξάγει στρατεῖαν ὡς ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους*), and which illustrates the facility with which adjective

and substantive expressions assume this character. It is in fact one of the tendencies of language in general.

In addition to these analogies is the admitted but comparatively rare and little recognized use of *ὁ αὐτός* to represent (like *idem*) a subject with a second predicate. This usage is illustrated in Callim. *Epigr.* 39. 2, by the *αὐτή* of the Codex Palatinus,¹ in defense of which Schneider quotes several other examples, among them, Thucyd. i. 23; iii. 47; Plut. *Timol.* 13; Orph. *Lithic.* 399; Orph. *Hymn.* iii. 8; xiii. 3. Aside from these examples an illustration of the construction is found in Thucyd. iii. 21. 10: *πύργοι ἦσαν μεγάλοι καὶ ἰσοπλατεῖς τῷ τείχει, διήκοντες ἕς τε τὸ ἔσω μέτωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὸ ἔξω.* In this sentence *οἱ αὐτοὶ* obviously repeats the subject in purely pronominal fashion.

The question now is, can this usage be extended to the oblique cases, so that *ὁ αὐτός* assumes the functions virtually of a pronoun of reference. The presumptions, as we have seen, are in favor of this view, and it is further supported by the Platonic examples themselves, which may now be considered.

The first is from an unauthentic dialogue—*Sis.* 388*a* (where the writer speaks of the game of odd and even): *οὐδὲν ἐπιστάμενοι δὴ που περὶ τῶν ἀρτίων τε καὶ περιττῶν, ὧν ἂν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ ταῖς αὐτῶν ἔχουσιν, ὁμῶς ἐπιτυγχάνουσι λέγοντες περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τάληθῃ.* This seems to be a conclusive example. There is no question of the text, and tried by all the tests, *τῶν αὐτῶν* stands in the most perfect pronominal relation to the preceding substantives. *αὐτῶν* itself would not be more a pronoun.

Apol. 24*a*: *ταῦτα ἔστι ὑμῖν τάληθῃ . . . καίτοι οἶδα σχεδὸν ὅτι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀπεχθάνομαι.*

In this passage *τοῖς αὐτοῖς* seems to fulfil all the conditions of a pronoun of identity. It means precisely the same as the preceding *ταῦτα*, to which it refers, and the context admits of no other identity than that of pronoun and antecedent. Under these conditions the pronominal relation becomes inevitable. The only alternative is to change the text, but this involves setting aside the overwhelming authority of the consensus of B and T. Even

¹ I am indebted for this reference to Professor H. W. Prescott of the University of California.

when this radical step is taken (as in the *τοῖς αὐτοῖς τούτοις* of Schanz and the *αὐτοῖς τούτοις* of the Oxford edition) the change is due to a desire to introduce a pronominal meaning, which *τοῖς αὐτοῖς* itself supplies.

Rep. 525a: καὶ οὕτω τῶν ἀγωγῶν ἂν εἴη καὶ μεταστρεπτικῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ὄντος θέαν ἢ περὶ τὸ ἐν μάθησις. Ἀλλὰ μέντοι, ἔφη, τοῦτό γ' ἔχει οὐχ ἥκιστα ἢ περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄψις. ἅμα γὰρ ταῦτὸν ὡς ἐν τε ὁρῶμεν καὶ ὡς ἀπειρα τὸ πλῆθος. This is an interesting and significant passage. The text has the highest authority, being the consensus of A, the Paris MS of the ninth century, and of the Venetus II (O) of the twelfth. As it stands, τὸ αὐτό repeats the preceding τὸ ἐν. Over against "the intellectual apprehension of the one" (to quote the words of Adam) Plato sets "the visual apprehension of the same." Disregard of this construction has led some editors on the authority mainly of Ξ and T (the latter of the fourteenth and the former of the fifteenth century) to read αὐτό. Adam in his edition retains τὸ αὐτό, saying in his note,

I formerly read αὐτό instead of τὸ αὐτό with Ξ and a few inferior MSS. αὐτό which Bekker, Schneider, and Stallbaum adopt is easier, but lacking in authority; and τὸ αὐτό is in reality more elegant. The marked antithesis between ἢ περὶ τὸ ἐν μάθησις and ἢ περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὄψις makes it clear that τὸ αὐτό means "the same" as that with which ἢ μάθησις was concerned (viz. τὸ ἐν), and not (as Hermann imagined) "one and the same object of vision" (like ταῦτόν presently).

Thus the pronominal usage in this passage would seem to be justified by the sound interpretation of the only MSS tradition of the text that is entitled to weight.

Tim 59c: ὅταν τις ἀναπαύσεως ἕνεκα τοὺς περὶ τῶν ὄντων ἀεὶ κατατιθέμενος λόγους, τοὺς γενέσεως πέρι διαθεόμενος εἰκότας ἀμεταμέλητον ἡδονὴν κτᾶται, μέτριον ἂν ἐν τῇ βίῳ παιδίαν καὶ φρόνιμον ποιοίτο. ταύτη δὴ καὶ τὰ νῦν ἐφέντες τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο τῶν αὐτῶν πέρι τὰ ἐξῆς εἰκόστα δόμεν τῇδε. The τῶν αὐτῶν of the text has no variants, and it seems also clear that its function is to represent the τοὺς γενέσεως πέρι εἰκότας which goes before. "By way of recreation," says Plato, "one may find pleasure in plausible theories of becoming. Let us therefore in this spirit proceed to discuss the probabilities of the same."

Tim. 68a: διὰ ταύτας τὰς δυνάμεις δριμύα πάντα τοιαῦτα ἐλέχθη, τῶν δὲ αὐτῶν προλελεπτυσμένων μὲν ὑπὸ σηπεδόνος, εἰς δὲ τὰς στενὰς φλέβας ἐνδυσόμενων In this passage τῶν δὲ αὐτῶν is the reading of all the MSS without exception; it coincides in meaning with the foregoing πάντα, and there can be little doubt, I think, of its pronominal force.

Leg. 797b: φημὶ κατὰ πάσας πόλεις τὸ τῶν παιδιῶν γένος ἡγνοῖσθαι σύμπασιν ὅτι κυριώτατόν ἐστι περὶ θέσεως νόμων, ἢ μονίμους εἶναι τοὺς τεθέντας ἢ μή. ταχθέν μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐᾷ καὶ τὰ σπουδῇ κείμενα νόμιμα μένειν ἡσυχῇ, καινούμενα δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ καινοτομούμενα τούτου πόλει λῶβην οὐκ εἶναι μείζω φαῖμεν ἢν ὀρθότατα λέγοντες. The general construction of this sentence is somewhat loose, but it is clear that the subject, τὸ τῶν παιδιῶν γένος, is first represented by αὐτό, and that it is then taken up by the more emphatic τὰ αὐτά. It is only on this supposition, as Stallbaum remarks, that the passage can be correctly interpreted—quo neglecto sensus loci nullo modo percipi recte potest. τὰ αὐτά is thus as pronominal as αὐτό itself.

There are other passages in which I think the same construction should be recognized, though there is the possibility of a different interpretation. One that requires a word of comment is *Tim.* 54c: ἐκ γὰρ ἑνὸς ἅπαντα πεφυκότα λυθέντων τε τῶν μειζόνων πολλὰ σμικρὰ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν συστήσεται, δεχόμενα τὰ προσήκοντα ἑαυτοῖς σχήματα.

Archer-Hind in his edition takes τῶν αὐτῶν to mean "from the same elements," but this can be correct only on the supposition that the smaller bodies are identical in composition with the larger ones. This can hardly be the case. The whole point of the passage is the capacity which three of the primary elements possess of being generated into one another. This generation takes place when larger bodies are dissolved and smaller ones with fewer elements are formed out of them. Stallbaum makes τῶν αὐτῶν refer to μειζόνων, rendering, solutisque maioribus multa parva ex iisdem existent. So also Schneider—et maioribus solutis multa parva ex eisdem consistent—and Jowett—"when the greater bodies are broken up, many small bodies will spring

out of them." If this latter interpretation be the right one, τῶν αὐτῶν has here also the part of a pronoun.

The use of ὁ αὐτός to repeat a previous subject with a second predicate is rare in Plato. Compare *Crat.* 390c; *Hip. Min.* 367c; *Rep.* 524a; *Leg.* 967b.

In the light of this pronominal use of ὁ αὐτός I wish to consider the much-discussed passage in *Rep.* 397b: καὶ ἔαν τις ἀποδιδῶ πρέπουσαν ἀρμονίαν καὶ ῥυθμὸν τῇ λέξει, ὀλίγου πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν γίγνεται, λέγειν τῷ ὀρθῶς λέγοντι, καὶ ἐν μιᾷ ἀρμονίᾳ—σμικραὶ γὰρ αἱ μεταβολαί—καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν ῥυθμῷ ὡσαύτως παραπλησίῳ τι.

The passage hinges on the interpretation of πρὸς τὴν αὐτήν, which the commentators uniformly regard as involving an ellipsis. Lewis Campbell suggested an original χορδὴν; Schneider would supply ἀρμονίαν in view of the following ἐν μιᾷ ἀρμονίᾳ; Ficino understood λέξιν; so also Stallbaum, Hartmann (*Notae Criticae*, p. 85), Jowett, and others. In suggesting χορδὴν Professor Campbell assumes that the phrase πρὸς τὴν αὐτήν became current as it stands, and was understood without reference to the immediate context, but as it occurs nowhere else this supposition must remain mere conjecture. Hartmann also objects to χορδὴν on the ground that, if it were understood, there would be no need of adding ἐν μιᾷ ἀρμονίᾳ. This objection applies with much greater force to Schneider's ἀρμονίαν. The use of πρὸς also in the sense here required is exceedingly difficult, Adam's reference, "for the musical sense of πρὸς" to Eur. *Alc.* 346, being quite beside the point. There is the same difficulty in respect to πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν—"in the same style"—for which no parallel of any kind has been found. (κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν, it may be remarked, could be defended.) But even granting this use of πρὸς, the phrase itself is hopelessly ambiguous, and whether one word or another be supplied, it leaves the sentence as a whole incapable of straightforward interpretation.

The difficulty in the interpreting of this passage seems to have been due to a feeling that τὴν αὐτήν must at all events be an adjective, whereas it is in reality a pronoun. It points not forward, but backward, and in its reference there is no ambiguity. The antecedent substantive can only be λέξει, the meaning being that

if one uses properly the style appropriate to a good man, then, *with respect to the same*, correct recitation comes virtually to be in one harmony and likewise in a single rhythm. *πρός* has thus its natural meaning, while for the correlation of *καὶ* with *καὶ δὴ καὶ* we may compare *Leg.* 709c. In point of sense the interpretation permits of a straightforward statement of the two qualities that characterize the style under consideration. The repetition of *λέξει* by *τὴν αὐτήν* is also in keeping with Plato's own exuberance of expression.

J. ELMORE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY